



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The new Congress will be imbued with the same spirit to such a degree that scant consideration will be shown to any of its members, either in the House or in the Senate, who may attempt to plead the cause of Filipino right to independence, or turn the country back to its historic principles and high professions of devotion to human rights and human liberties.

In the direction of military and naval development the result is just as certain. That increasingly powerful circle of men who have turned every stone for years in behalf of their navy and army projects will be bolder and more exacting than ever. Something very like European militarism, if yet some way off, is now, like an irresistible charmer, looking us straight in the face. The naval promoters will push forward the plans for the thirty or more new war-vessels which the Construction Board had in hand awaiting the result of the election. The support of the Administration will be given to these plans, and Congress will be skilfully lobbied in their behalf, and will accept them in large part. Rear Admiral Crowninshield's startling plea, in his recent report from the Navigation Bureau, that the personnel of the navy must be quadrupled in order to put the country into condition "to fight a first-class European power," will stir the blood of "patriotic" officials and congressmen into feverish anxiety lest some powerful foe fall upon us unawares.

The outcome of all this is perfectly evident. The country has allowed to be forced upon it the new policy of aggressive, forceful expansion; therefore a big navy and an "adequate" army are absolutely essential to carry it out! General MacArthur's annual report, received since the election, dispels all illusion as to the collapse of Filipino opposition, so overweeningly prophesied by men who sought to shift to the shoulders of others blame for the outbreak and continuance of hostilities. "At present and for many years to come," he says, "the necessity of a large American military and naval force is too apparent to admit of discussion." The standing army, therefore, as well as the navy, will be permanently enlarged, to what extent ultimately nobody can foresee; for it will be done gradually, and with as much covertness as possible, in order to delude the people and prevent their righteous antagonism.

This, then, whatever the result of the election may signify as to the sentimental attitude of the people, is the practical situation that confronts the country. There is nothing whatever in it to inspire hope in those who have boasted to the world that the United States has been the political leader of the nations in the development of the principles of brotherhood and peace, and who wish her to continue in this leadership. But it is no time for despair and renunciation of effort. The gloomier the prospect and the greater the peril, the more faithful must we all be in declar-

ing the truth, setting forth the danger and pointing out the way of escape.

The lengths to which the country will go in the paths of aggression and injustice, in loading itself with the burdens and dangers of militarism, debasing its character and crippling the unsurpassed power for good in the world which its institutions, if faithfully maintained, rightly give it, will depend largely on the loyalty to duty of those who see clearly the perils of the situation. Nothing could be more disastrous, in view of the circumstances, than a blind and easy confidence in destiny, a hopeless surrender to the drift of things, an easy-going belief that after all "the powers that be" will bring everything out right in the end. Unfortunately, that is just the kind of spirit that many will exhibit.

The country will some day come to its senses on this subject, as it did on the matter of slavery and its conduct towards the Indians. But, alas, that it should have to go through the slough of another great iniquity! If it can be saved from this, it will only be through the individual and collective efforts of those who are already aware of the whirling speed at which we are going down. There is work to do in every corner of the land, something more serious than election-campaign gossip, splutter and catchy argument. Let it be done now, and with the purpose that there shall be no relaxation of energy if a whole generation shall be necessary for the accomplishment of the difficult task.

Dean Farrar's Imperialism, War and Christianity.

In the September *North American Review* was an article by Rev. F. W. Farrar, Dean of Canterbury, on "Imperialism and Christianity," which was worthy of the pen of the most materialistic defender of war. Von Moltke himself could not have done better. Its immediate purpose was to try to relieve many English Christians of the burden "pressing heavily" on their consciences in regard to the South African war; its wider purpose, to destroy the growing sensitiveness of Christian consciences in general as to the lawfulness of war, and to teach the followers of Christ that war is a part of the "divine crusade" of their Master against the "machinations of the devil," and therefore to be entered into with a high heart, free from the slightest misgiving.

The grounds on which the venerable clergyman's argument rests are even more surprising than the extraordinary position which he takes. He defines "imperialism," as now used in English, as "that view of national duty and policy which maintains that we are bound to uphold, even at the cost of war, and in spite of all hazards, the empire over those vast regions which the providence of God has placed under our dominion and immediate influence." The most

ordinary reader knows that this definition leaves out the central meaning of the word, as used in English, namely, the extension of empire for self-interest, aggression and self-imposed rule over other peoples, — a meaning given by the opponents of imperialism, who brought the word into use.

But Dr. Farrar does not deal with the question of imperialism at all. He merely makes it the starting point for an argument by which he attempts to prove that war is not only not inconsistent with the purposes and methods of Christ, but that it is, on the other hand, an essential part of Christianity.

In enumerating the charges brought against war by its foes, he mentions, in his own glowing style, the "frightful pictures" of the battlefield, which are appalling enough, truly; but he does not so much as hint at the spiritual features of fighting — the hatred, the desire to crush fellow beings, the fury, the lying and deceit, the brutalizing of spirit, which are essentially involved in every war. It is these spiritual characteristics, and not the physical horrors in themselves, that render war essentially immoral. If "war, in any just and holy cause, is not only defensible, but a positive duty," then it is a positive duty not only to produce the "frightful pictures" of the battlefield, but the brutalizing and degradation of spirit as well in multitudes of men.

"In any just and holy cause!" This goes far beyond the old argument of the justifiableness of war in self-defense. It is to the last degree the "holy war" argument of the middle ages, which led to the extremest brutalities recorded in history, and which leads to them now, and will forever whenever it is followed out in practice.

Dr. Farrar's claim that "the suppression of all appeals to the decision of war would involve the certain and absolute triumph of robbery, oppression, greed and injustice," is the purest assumption. How does he know? It has never been tried. To suppose such a thing as the entire suppression of all appeals to the decision of war possible "while the world continues to be what it is," is the height of logical absurdity. But if the world should decide to suppress all such appeals, it would no longer be what it is. In that event, is Dr. Farrar sure as a prophet that robbery and injustice would absolutely triumph? To suppose so is to show absolute scepticism as to the power of moral forces and to assume that might — brute force — is the supreme factor in civilization.

His assertion that "the occasional necessity of the resort to war, in order to settle serious national differences, is recognized throughout the whole of Holy Scripture," needs better proof than he gives. That "whole books of the Old Testament ring with the clash of conflict" nobody denies. But he has forgotten the "I say unto you" of the New Testament, which the Master himself with much detail set over against the ignorance, carnality and hard-heartedness

of the Old Testament times. His statement, in proof of New Testament support of war, that John the Baptist did not give the soldiers who came to him "the most distant hint that their employment was unlawful," is curiously irrelevant. Jesus Christ had not then begun to teach. John the Baptist's teaching was not under the New Testament dispensation at all, but was the last stage of the old, which was to "decrease." The least in the new kingdom of love was to be greater than John, both in knowledge and in practical life.

"Our Lord never forbade war." True. Nor did he forbid slavery, or gambling, or arson, or wife-beating, or infanticide. But he forbade the spirit out of which all these spring; and in more intense terms and stronger metaphors did he forbid the spirit out of which war springs. If war is to be supported by our Lord's silence, nearly every form of iniquity and injustice can be justified in the same way. "He sometimes took his metaphors from war," says the Dean. So he did from unjust judges and lying and tricky stewards, whose practices, in that day or this, Dr. Farrar would be the last to defend.

In order to support his contention, Dr. Farrar makes his own definition of war. "War is but the collective form of the age-long, unceasing conflict of the human race against the usurpations of tryannous evil." A very meager knowledge of history declares war to be, on the contrary, "the bankruptcy of reason," as Mr. Novicow has recently called it; the result of the conflict of the greed, ambition, lust of power and domination which men and peoples have exhibited towards one another in utter disregard of reason and right. Resistance "against the usurpations of tryannous evil" has played an inconspicuous part in even what have been called "just and necessary wars." On the other hand, the catalogue is a long one of the cases where just such wars have furnished the most monstrous "usurpations of tryannous evil."

Dr. Farrar "almost hesitates" to say with Wordsworth that "carnage is God's daughter," that "his most perfect instrument is the mutual slaughter of men;" but with another poet he ridicules the turning of the other cheek, and "ventures to approve" the declaration that "the cannons are God's preachers, when the time is ripe for war," and that those who preach non-resistance of evil with brute force are "idle teachers," "miserable creatures." He can see nothing but weakness and meanness of spirit in men who for principle's sake refuse to take part in the gruesome business of man-killing!

He ventures also to reassert the threadbare and long-exploded theory that "war often tends in a marked manner to the ennoblement of individual character." It is true that war, debasing to character as its tendency always is, does not destroy some qualities which are usually ranked high in human nature,

and often gives them opportunity for manifesting themselves in unusual ways; but it never creates them. Courage is after all a very common virtue. There are ten thousand ways in which it is as conspicuously exhibited in common life as in war, and men and women, girls and boys, in multitudes, do not have to be trained by every device into automatic fighting machines to induce them to feel the "absolute supremacy of duty" in these testing places of ordinary life. It would not be difficult to show by actual statistics that there are as many exhibitions of desertion, cowardice, pretense of sickness to escape danger, abject weakness from fear, among soldiers as anywhere else. Cases are on record where, in a dangerous charge, two-thirds of the men have fallen out of the line from mere paralysis of fear, where very few were actually killed or disabled. What Dr. Farrar calls "death-defying courage," "unflinching battle-brunt of heroism," is often nothing more than pure recklessness, and is not unfrequently exhibited by men who have lost all the finer moral virtues and become as nearly brutalized as men ever become. Physical courage is peculiarly an animal virtue.

There is self-sacrifice, "tenderness of self-sacrifice," in war, but it is never the highest and purest self-sacrifice. We do not underestimate it when we say that it is never Christian self-sacrifice of the kind which Jesus Christ exhibited. The self-sacrifice of war is for "your own side," your own captain or fellow-soldier; never for the enemy, at least not until he is wounded or a prisoner, and helpless. It is made with gun in hand and the purpose in heart to kill as many of the other side as possible. Gild it with whatever glittering phraseology, the self-sacrifice shown in war has little in common with that exhibited by the Cross, under a representation of which Dr. Farrar fervidly preaches the gospel every Sunday.

That war "has tended again and again to save whole nations from the eating canker of those vices which too often grow up in the long continuance of peace," is a wearisomely threadbare assertion. No one making it ever attempts to prove it by citing specific cases. The real truth is that these famous vices of peace are largely the direct result of previous wars, or of "armed peace," and the wars which are said to save nations from them are simply the last inevitable expression of the vices. What saves the nations, so far as they are saved, if at all, is the abandonment of the vices, and not the wars, which are only their last stage and natural fruit. One iniquity never cures another.

Dr. Farrar's last test is that of "saintly men among professional soldiers." Would he apply the same principle to slavery, and say that it is "a divine institution," a "fraction" of God's method of saving the world from wickedness, because saintly men, even in this century, have held slaves? It is gratifying to know that a few professional soldiers have been

able to retain so much of Christianity in their lives. But how few they are! How the defenders of war search for one, and when they have found him, how much they make of him! Hedley Vicars, Sir Henry Havelock, General Gordon,—how far can one go with the list? For every general or private who has preserved in some measure his Christianity, a thousand, ten thousand—how many shall one say?—have lost it, totally and irretrievably. That these men who courageously kept up their devotions and abstained from drink and licentiousness were among the bravest and most reliable of soldiers, goes without the saying. But that they were among the most "consistent Christians that ever lived," depends entirely upon what Christianity is conceived to be. According to the Christianity of the example of Jesus and of the Sermon on the Mount, in its plain and natural sense, they were, with all their nobleness and courage, very far from being consistent Christians.

More and more does the conscience of the Christian world feel the burden of having to apologize for the part which these professing Christian men have taken in war, and more still for the defense of it made by so many preachers. Unless the growing light turns again into darkness, the venerable Dean's efforts to persuade Christian men of "sensitive consciences" that "war is at times a necessary duty," "in no way at conflict with the obligations by which every true Christian is eternally bound," are destined soon to be ranked with those casuistic, opportunist defenses by good men of iniquitous systems of which the history of the great moral contests of progress is so full.

Editorial Notes.

London's
Shame.

The more complete the knowledge we obtain of the debauchery in London on the evening of the return of the City Volunteers from South Africa, the more horrible it seems. The debauch went not only to the lengths of low and vulgar rowdyism and immorality, but seemingly of positive insanity as well. *Eleven hundred* people were killed and wounded in the mad rush and jam. Mr. Arnold White, in a letter to the *Philadelphia Ledger*, says of the scene: "The sight was appalling, bestial and horrible. Hooliganism, as the rowdy element is called, from the name of a leader of one of the gangs who defy the police and assault the public, abounded. Drunkenness, vice and brutality met the eye everywhere in the streets on Monday night. . . . Bands of lawless rascals perambulated the streets, kissing every woman and girl they could catch, and passing from one to another any particularly good-looking female. Thoughtful Englishmen hang their heads with shame at the decay of faith in the nation, for to the decay of faith, the worship of materialism and the consequent outbreak of immorality and idleness,—almost convertible terms,—the decadence of our nation is due."